Survey Results
EQR Users Group Workshop
September 29-30, 2003,

Control Areas, Trading Hubs, Refiling Policy

1) Do you agree with the using the NERC Control Area names as proposed?

YES	51
NO	0
Other	6 - Add Trading Hub to Control Area. - Update Montana Power Co. to N.Western if appropriate - Standardized spelling O.K., but no discreet limits to list names - Needs Review -With changes made as markets change - I believe it's easier (and more consistent) to use NERC Region names in this field. - Only comfortable if add a category for "Other."

2) Do you agree with using the Trading Hub Names as proposed?

YES	35
NO	3
Other	17 -Yes, as discussed & amended w/o market zone definition -Hourly trades might mix the result when compare to OTC trades -This issue needs further discussion -Add PJM West "Hub" -Standardized spelling O.K.; but no discreet limits to list names -Needs review -Yes, pending conf. w/ trading marketing group -With changes made as markets change -Need further clarifications on definition of how hubs will work -Need additional changes for list for final approval -Not as proposed; names need to be modified -Changes need to be discussed and considered; concept is good Needs further review to keep this simple and straight forward yet provide the FERC with the necessary information. Likely to require some compromise in data quality. -Either a transaction occurs at a trading hub or a control area. If the intention is to roll up transactions, then the use of region should be utilized. Can trading hubs be added to the list of NERC Control Area names? -I am not sure if the IT requirements for this change will be overly burdensome or not. -No refiling of immaterial changes should be required ever.

3) Do you agree that the proposed EQR Refiling Policy is reasonable?

YES	54
NO	0
Other	5 -As modified in the EQR workshop -Still needs to be ironed out. -As changed -how would revisions/corrections after 120 days be handled? -Generally, the policy is reasonable. However, we have issues with the details of filing the CA-ISO revised data because of the manner in which our trading and accounting systems are set up. Needs further discussion for us, but we support the direction being taken. -Yes, provided that material changes is defined. -Must have a "materiality" test for the initial refile. Otherwise, we will file as many EQRs for each company as there are quarters with revisions, which can potentially result in multiple filings rather than 1 EQR filed each quarter per company. e.g., If there were 4 prior quarters with any changes, there would be 5 EQRs for that company filed, rather than 1. The scenario stays the same (rather than rolling off) each quarter. 5 next quarter, 5 next quarter, 5 next quarter......

Product Names—Deletions

1) Power

Delete	48
Keep	2
Other	0

2) Back-Up Power

Delete	49
Keep	1
Other	0

3) Cost-Based Power

Delete	46
Keep	3
Other	0 - I still have some Cost-Based Power Contracts is this designation just for transactions or both contracts and transactions?

4) Economy Power

Delete	48
Keep	2
Other	0

5) Interchange Power

Delete	49
Keep	1
Other	0

6) Supplemental Power

Delete	49
Keep	1
Other	0

7) Demand Change-TBD

Delete	
Keep	
Other	

Should be CAPACITY

8) Unit Capacity

Delete	47
Keep	2
Other	1 - Should be unit power

9) Dynamic Transfer

Delete	46
Keep	2
Other	2
	- Per discussion, w/wind turbines, we have agreements where we store the power and deliver it later. We take the energy into our system as its produced, and balance against the current production. Later (usually one month) we return the energy to the customer; they now know the specific quantity available from the intermittent resource. We charge a "storage fee" on a MW basis- I have been reporting this on a per MWh basis as energy.
	-Might be useful where DC line exists
	- If the FERC doesn't care to distinguish this differently than "energy" then I certainly don't care either and it can be eliminated.
	- Needs further discussion

10) Emergency Energy

Delete	41
Keep	5
Other	4
	- If deleted, price change could appear out of line
	- FERC to decide if they need it
	- I propose to keep since being a part of MAIN we still are called upon to supply emergency energy with a price of $100.00/mwh

11) Energy Furnished Without Charge

Delete	47
Keep	3
Other	0

12) Fuel Replacement Energy

Delete	47
Keep	2
Other	0

13) Indexed Peaking

Delete	48
Keep	2
Other	0

14) Load Following

Delete	47
Keep	2
Other	1
	-Revise definition to Full Requirement

15) Marginal Peaking

Delete	49
Keep	1
Other	0

16) Peaking

Delete	47
Keep	3
Other	0

17) Standards of Conduct

Delete	49
Keep	1
Other	0

18) Billing Service

Delete	44
Keep	6
Other	0

19) Return in Kind Transactions Between Control Areas

Delete	47
Keep	3
Other	0

20) Sale with Exchange

Delete	47
Keep	3
Other	0 -Depends on decision on DA vs. RT

21) Network

Delete	45
Keep	4
Other	1 - I would like to clarify. Wasn't it decided at the last EQR meeting that Network would stay for contracts? Will Network be removed from transactions but still be available for contracts?

22) Specialized Affiliate Transactions

Delete	48
Keep	0
Other	0

23) Reliability Agreement

Delete	46
Keep	4
Other	0
	-Might be needed

- Overall comments:
- Delete all except "Demand Charge" and add "Full Requirements."
- Add full requirements item

Product Names—Definitions for Contract-Only Products

1) Exchange Agreement

Agree	42
Disagree	0
Other	0

2) Must Run Agreement

Agree	42
Disagree	0
Other	1 - The Contract requires a unit to run not at all times but "upon request by the counter party, often for reliability purposes." - We think the definition is good but the product should be Capacity Charge.

3) Network Operating Agreement

Agree	42
Disagree	0
Other	0

4) System Operating Agreement

Agree	42
Disagree	0
Other	1 - Should delete from requirement

5) Unit Power Sale-Energy

Agree	34
Disagree	8
Other	0 - Delete - Delete and add class name - Agree as modified to unit contingent - To be consistent with Capacity Charge, this should be Energy Charge.

6) Unit Power Sale-Capacity

Agree	34
Disagree	8
Other	0 - Delete - Delete and add class name - Agree as modified to unit contingent

7) Direct Assignment Facilities Charge

Agree	41
Disagree	0
Other	2 - Delete: this is a charge in an interconnection agreement- it is not a product sold on a continuing basis - Should be a product type

8) Point-to-Point Agreement

Agree	41
Disagree	0
Other	0

9) Interconnection Agreement

Agree	42
Disagree	0
Other	1 - Establishes contract that the terms and conditions for connection to a transmission system

10) Membership Agreement

Agree	40
Disagree	0
Other	2 - Delete: ISO should file its customers service agreement - Feel this should be deleted based on the fact that one files under WSPP membership

11) System Impact Study and /or Facilities Study Charge(s)

Agree	40
Disagree	0
Other	1 - Delete - Feel Studies should be deleted, as they are a precursor to IFA's. Studies are not directly filed with FERC unless there is a dispute with a specific customer.

12) Transmission Owners Agreement

Agree	41
Disagree	0
Other	0

Product Names—Contract Products and Transactions

1) Booked Out Power

Agree	31
Disagree	3
Other	0

2) Capacity

Agree	27
Disagree	4
Other	4 - We think the definition is good but the produc t should be Capacity Charge. -Capacity (product name) X Rate = Capacity Charge

3a) Demand Charge

Agree	5
Disagree	2
Other	1 -Delete

3) Customer Charge

Agree	34
Disagree	0
Other	0

4) Energy

Agree	32
Disagree	0
Other	2

5) Fuel Charge

Agree	33
Disagree	0
Other	1 -Delete "Charge"

6) Grandfathered Bundled

Agree	34
Disagree	0
Other	0

7) Real Power Transmission Loss

Agree	34
Disagree	0
Other	0

8) Other

Agree	32
Disagree	0
Other	0

9) Energy Imbalance---tabled

Agree	
Disagree	
Other	-For all OATT prod.; refer to schedule number in OATT

10) Reactive Supply & Voltage Control

Agree	32
Disagree	0
Other	1 -Map from ISO definitions

11) Regulation & Frequency Response

Agree	32
Disagree	0
Other	1 -Map from ISO definitions

12) Schedule System Control & Dispatch

Agree	30
Disagree	0
Other	1 -Map from ISO definitions

13) Spinning Reserve

Agree	32
Disagree	0
Other	1 -Map from ISO definitions

14) Supplemental Reserve

Agree	30
Disagree	0
Other	2 -Map from ISO definitions

15) Black Start Service

Agree	32
Disagree	0
Other	0 - Map from ISO definitions - Include Non-Spin Reserve and Replacement Reserve with Supplemental Reserve in definition